

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-2, 12, 15 and 23 are currently being amended. No new matter is being added. After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15-23, and 32-33 are now pending in this application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-12, 15-19, 22-23, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,173 (Desai) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,529,980 (Liotine) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,442,340 (Dykema).

The Examiner acknowledged that Desai does not disclose “that the control circuit causes a LED to transmit the stored characteristic of the activation signal.”

The Examiner stated that Liotine teaches:

a transmitter and receiver for controlling garage door openers and other devices (see col. 1, lines 17-20). Liotine further discloses that the receiver 30 (trainable transceiver; see fig. 3) comprises a control circuit (via microcomputer 33) and an infrared transmitter (via LED signal transmitter 36). Liotine further discloses that the receiver 30 transmits a new code to the transmitter 9 using the light emitting diode 36 (see col. 1, lines 45-55; also see col. 3, lines 44-48). Liotine further discloses that the transmitter 9 comprises an optical receiver (via infra red receiver 21; see fig. 1; also see col. 8, lines 4-9).

The Examiner further stated that:

From the teaching of Liotine it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the trainable transceiver system of Desai to include an optical receiver in the portable transmitter and a LED to transmit the signal in the control circuit of the vehicle transmitter for the

process of optical transmission as taught by Liotine in order to eliminate interference between closely spaced transmitters and receivers since the transmitter and receiver will be in close range to each other when using infra red transmission and reception (see col. 2, lines 15-16).

Even though the Examiner believes that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that when the light emitting diode 36 of Liotine will transmit a signal to the transmitter 9 it will light up giving visual indication to the user that the LED transmitter 36 is transmitting a signal (because it is well known that LEDs are used to give visual application to the human eye), and since the LED transmitter 36 is being used during the programming process (training process), the microcomputer 33 is lighting the LED during the training process.

In order to further support the Examiner assertion, Dykema discloses a trainable transceiver system (see fig. 3), wherein a trainable transmitter comprises a control circuit (via microcomputer 101; see fig. 2) and an LED 48, wherein the LED 48 illuminated (visual indication) when the transmitter 55 is in the learning mode (training process; see fig. 2; also see col. 3, lines 29-35).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, would not have been obvious in view of Desai, alone or in any proper combination with Liotine and Dykema under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Desai alone or in any proper combination with Liotine and Dykema does not disclose, teach or suggest a “trainable transceiver system for providing an activation signal characteristic to a portable transmitter” comprising, in combination with other elements, “a light emitting diode (LED) configured to transmit the characteristic of the activation signal” received from an original transmitter for actuating a remote device “via an optical transmission to the optical receiver of the portable transmitter” and “a control circuit configured ... to cause the LED to transmit the stored characteristic of the activation signal, wherein the control circuit is configured to light the LED during a training process of the trainable transceiver system to visually communicate information to a user of the system” as recited in Claim 1, as amended.

Desai discloses a garage door opener 30, a garage door opener remote control 30a (e.g., original transmitter), a garage door opener actuator 24 in a vehicle (e.g., trainable transceiver), and a key/fob combination 37 (e.g., portable transmitter). (Desai, column 2 lines 23-47; and FIG. 1.) The communication between devices is accomplished using radio frequency (RF) signals. (Desai, column 2, lines 44-64; and FIG. 1.) Liotine discloses a receiver 30, such as a garage door opener, that includes an LED for transmitting an optical signal to an original transmitter 9 having an optical receiver. (Liotine, column 1, line 60-61; and column 2, lines 44-64.) Dykema discloses a trainable transmitter 55 having an LED that flashes to communicate information to the user during training. (Dykema, column 3, lines 29-35.) Applicant neither admits nor denies that the references are properly combinable, however, if combined, the references at best would teach a garage door opener having an RF receiver and an LED for transmitting an optical signal, an original transmitter having an RF transmitter and an optical receiver, a trainable transmitter having an LED used as a visual indicator and a key/fob combination for transmitting and receiving RF signals.

Applicant respectfully submits that a system having a garage door opener with an LED for transmitting an optical signal to an original transmitter and a trainable transceiver having an LED used as a visual indicator (alleged combination of prior art) is not the same as a trainable transceiver system having an LED that both communicates an optical signal to a portable transmitter and communicates visual information to the user during the training process.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Desai, Liotine and Dykema does not disclose, teach or suggest a “trainable transceiver system for providing an activation signal characteristic to a portable transmitter” comprising, in combination with other elements, “a light emitting diode (LED) configured to transmit the characteristic of the activation signal” received from an original transmitter for actuating a remote device “via an optical transmission to the optical receiver of the portable transmitter” and “a control circuit configured ... to cause the LED to transmit the stored characteristic of the activation signal, wherein the control circuit is

configured to light the LED during a training process of the trainable transceiver system to visually communicate information to a user of the system” as recited in Claim 1, as amended.

Independent Claim 12 recites a “trainable transceiver system” comprising “a trainable transceiver ... configured to receive a characteristic of an activation signal from an original transmitter for actuating a remote device ... and to retransmit the characteristic of the activation signal via an optical signal sent from an LED” to a portable transmitter, “wherein the trainable transceiver is configured to light the LED during a training process of the trainable transceiver to visually communicate information to a user of the system.” Applicant respectfully submits that Desai, Liotine and Dykema do not disclose, teach or suggest the method of Claim 12 for reasons similar to those provided with respect to independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 23 recites a “trainable transceiver” comprising “an LED configured to transmit the characteristic via an optical signal to a portable device” and “a control circuit ... configured to receive a characteristic of an activation signal from an original transmitter for actuating a remote device ... [and] to light the LED during a training process of the trainable transceiver system to visually communicate information to a user of the system.” Applicant respectfully submits that Desai, Liotine and Dykema do not disclose, teach or suggest the method of Claim 23 for reasons similar to those provided with respect to independent Claim 1.

To transform Desai, Liotine and Dykema into the subject matter of Claims 1, 12 and 23 would require still further modification, and such modification is taught only by the Applicant’s own disclosure. Thus, Claim 1, 12 and 23, considered as a whole, would not have been obvious in view of Desai, Liotine and/or Dykema. Therefore, Claims 1, 12 and 23 are patentable over Desai in view of Liotine and Dykema.

Accordingly, at least one element recited in Claims 1, 12 and 23 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the combination of Desai, Liotine and Dykema. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-12, 15-19, 22-23, and 33 is respectfully requested.

On page 5 of the Office Action, Claims 9-10 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai in view of Liotine and Dykema, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,475,366 (Van Lente).

Dependent Claims 9-10, which depend from independent Claim 1, are also patentable over Desai, Liotine and Dykema for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Dependent Claims 20-21, which depend from independent Claim 12, are also patentable over Desai, Liotine and Dykema for at least the same reasons as Claim 12. The citation to Van Lente does not remedy the deficiencies of Desai, Liotine and Dykema noted in regard to Claims 1 and 12. The method described in Van Lente is directed to the forming a via that does not mention thinning the wafer. Thus, Claims 9-10 and 20-21 are also patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 9-10 and 20-21 is respectfully requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai in view of Liotine and Dykema, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,031,789 (Pinnow).

Dependent Claim 32, which depends from independent Claim 1, is also patentable over Desai, Liotine and Dykema for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. The citation to Pinnow does not remedy the deficiencies of Desai, Liotine and Dykema noted in regard to Claim 1. The method described in Pinnow is directed to the forming a via that does not mention thinning the wafer. Thus, Claim 32 is also patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 32 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-23, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

* * *

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7/07/2009

By /Jonathan D. Rowell/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5310
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Jonathan D. Rowell
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 63,710